political science. He mentions the facts of Richard's intolerable oppression of "the common people/" yet he severely condemns his deposition as giving a handle to rebellion against kingly rule. Rather inconsistent, to say the least, on the part of the worthy St Andrews professor.

He is a staunch advocate of the union of the crowns of Scotland and England, and thus a supporter of the shrewd policy that had given Margaret Tudor as wife to James IV. Such a union would mean the collapse of the old Franco-Scottish alliance, and it is singular that a man who was, almost half a Frenchman should favour the severance of the old bond between the two countries. At this period he was almost alone in his preference for a royal union, and, orthodox churchman though he was, he anticipated in this respect the policy of the militant reform party.

Major's influence as a thinker was confined to the schools. He was not a protagonist of militant reform in Church or State. He belonged to that class of reformer who can be zealous and dogmatic enough in his chair, but never succeeds in impressing his personality on the active world outside it. He would, we fear, never have faced the stake or the dungeon for the sake of reform, and the world accordingly very soon lost trace of him or his opinions, except perhaps through some of his more forcible pupils. Famous doctors had aired their views on philosophy and theology for several hundreds of years, and the world and the Church had gone from bad to worse notwithstanding. Church and world in Scotland, as elsewhere, stood in need of something more potent than mere academic disputations in the dreary style schoolmen. If any one would convince himself of the fact, let him try to plod through the worthy doctor's argumentative feats on the sentences of Peter Lombard in the Sorbonnic Latin of the period. Such discussions might sharpen his dialectic ingenuity. They would hardly make him better, or even wiser.

The betterment of the world, and more particularly of Scotland, came from a diametrically different type of mind. It was the martyrs of the Scottish Reformation, not the disputatious occupants of university chairs, who dealt the first effective blows of the army of revolution. And, for the most part, the martyrs in Scotland were not men of flaming reputa-